

## PULLOXHILL APPENDICES

***Please Note:*** that the Consultation Report is a collection of all comments received during the consultation process. Comments included within this document are those of individuals and organisations and do not necessarily represent the views of the District Council.

**PULLOXHILL APPENDIX ONE**  
Survey Additional Comments

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H1 15**

These additional comments were made by respondents who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Lynden Thompson	Don't think site could take more than 1 or 2 houses. 4 is too many for small plot. Traffic problems horrendous during school start and finish times and bearing in mind Pulloxhill Business Park and large lorries coming up and down.
Mr & Mrs Lowe	This site is suitable for 1 house only. The traffic down this road is already horrendous during school time with cars and also lorries from the industrial estate. Also the 42 new houses already started opposite.
Nicholas Thompson (Chairman Parish Council)	Only for 1-2 houses. The traffic along this road is horrendous when school is starting or finishing.
Peter Gray	I believe that there is always a demand for small development sites as not all of us want to live on large housing estates like the Wixams etc. There should also be more scope to improve shopping facilities in small villages to cut down traffic movements thus reducing global warming.  When will the council realise that not all of the general public want to live on large housing estates or in town centers, some of us like to live in the small villages and if you prevent any growth then they will deteriorate into ghost villages.  We must improve services within our villages like housing, butchers, bakers etc.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
G R Shortland	Two houses maximum.
Mr & Mrs C G Lines	These plots could suit 2 bungalows. There are no pavements at present outside this site which is situated at the bottom of a hill on a sharp bend with an adverse camber. Large volumes of fast moving traffic can be seen travelling to/from the A6 with little regard to the 30 mph limit. Additionally, large volumes of commercial vehicles plus large volumes of HGV traffic can be seen 24/7 moving to/from the Haulage Company sited at the near Business Park in particular. An increase in volume of traffic will occur from the near completion of the 8 business units.
Susan Young	If the site is used, there should be no more than two dwellings.
V Green	The small number of houses can presumably be accommodated with the existing services desirable that adequate parking within the individual sites to avoid any parking on the Pulloxhill Rd.

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

These additional comments were made by respondents who did not answer the site suitability question on the survey:

Submitted by	Comments
J Abrahams	This development will impact on the considerable through traffic going through Greenfield. Heavy lorries go through the village every day from 1 to 1:30am. They shake my house, it can only be a matter of time before subsidence occurs. In this case I shall hold the council responsible.
Mr. & Mrs. P. J. WOOD	This site is outside the settlement envelope and should therefore not be used for any sort of development be it residential or otherwise.
Roy van de Poll	<p>I believe this site has had past applications for housing development, including one which went to appeal. This site is totally unsuitable for development because :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It is outside the Settlement Envelope.</li> <li>2) Its development would increase the coalescence of the parishes of Pulloxhill and Greenfield. Already on the opposite side of the road, on the boundary between the two parishes, is an estate which will soon exceed 110 homes.</li> <li>3) For this site, and the one next door, on appeal the Inspector refused the application and one of the main reasons was to keep the open views of countryside between the fairly widely spaced dwellings.</li> </ol> <p>I suggest MBDC designate this site an important open space (or similar) in order to protect it from development in the long term.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H130**

These additional comments were made by respondents who did feel that this site is appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
Lynden Thompson	Traffic along road terrible when school starting & closing.
Nicholas Thompson (Chairman Parish Council)	Only for 1-2 houses. The traffic along this road is horrendous when school is starting or finishing.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site may be appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
G R Shortland	This site is suitable for one dwelling only. Due to size of site, road situation & suitability to the area.
Susan Young	If the site is used, there should be no more than two dwellings.
V Green	The number of houses presumably can be accommodated by the existing services - if not a reduced number, say to 2, may be acceptable. A reduced number would also have less impact upon road use. It is essential that each site has adequate parking for residents and visitors.

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
H E Williams	This site is only suitable for one house and is not appropriate for low cost housing. A house should reflect the character of the neighbouring properties.
J Abrahams	Developing this site directly impacts upon the residents of Greenfield. It will increase through traffic in Greenfield which is already at crisis point because of the through traffic. The heavy lorries going through the village from 1am to 1:30 every morning shake my house - it can only be a matter of time before subsistence occurs - I shall then hold the council responsible.
Mr & Mrs Lowe	4 houses on this site is not acceptable. More traffic onto an already congested road with school traffic and lorries and all other traffic from the industrial estate. More cars, more traffic, more children and the school is full?

Submitted by	Comments
Roy van de Poll	<p>This site has had past planning applications refused and one went to appeal. My reasons for considering this site as being totally unsuitable for housing or a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site is that it:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) Is outside the settlement envelope</li><li>2) Would cause further unacceptable coalescence of the parishes of Pulloxhill and Greenfield. The Woodlands Estate on the opposite side of the road has already made the boundary between the two, on that side of the road, a continuous stretch of housing with no break between the two.</li><li>3) The Inspector in his report on the earlier application, stressed as one of the key reasons for refusal that it was vitally important to maintain the open countryside views between the dwellings that are already there.</li></ol> <p>I would like to see this site also designated by MBDC as an important open space or similar in order to prevent development in the long term.</p>

Site Allocations, Issues and Options Consultation

**Ref Number: H152**

These additional comments were made by respondents who feel that this site is not appropriate to provide future housing in Mid-Beds:

Submitted by	Comments
David L O Smith	This site has exceptionally poor access from the High Street in a village that now has no services or facilities, other than a primary school and two pubs. The planning policy for Pulloxhill has been not to fill in behind the houses on the High Street and this is still appropriate. A housing development here would destroy the valuable amenity of the cricket pitch, which is used for numerous outdoor activities during the year (eg shows, rallies, fireworks, parties, celebrations). There are no significant employment opportunities in the village and most working adults would likely have to commute by car, many to Flitwick railway station. Adding 24 houses would increase the size of the village by about 10% and would detract from its rural character.
G C Young	Such a large development would entirely change the character of this small village.
G R Shortland	Important reservation facility for the village and local area.
H E Williams	This is the ONLY open recreation site used for various open air social functions & rallies for the village and outside organisations under the aegis of the cross keys. Bearing in mind there is no village hall with the church providing the only collective meeting place.
John Singh OBE	Pulloxhill does not have the infrastructure to cope with 24 more houses. The huge amount of traffic along its narrow roads already creates excessive noise nuisance and unacceptable levels of pollution. Pulloxhill is used as a short cut by cars and lorries from and to the A6 and there has been no serious attempt to dissuade traffic from using this route by instituting road calming measures etc. As there are no shopping facilities or a Post Office in the village the traffic situation would inevitably worsen with the building of new houses.
Liz Molyneux	Pulloxhill has no shops or a PO; it has a bus service two days a week and the extra traffic would be disruptive to a small community. There is not the infrastructure to accommodate such a large development - 24 more houses is almost 10% of the existing size of the village!
Mr. & Mrs. P. J. Wood	Any development on this site will result in gross over-development of rural land. It will urbanise the village. This site is next to a business park/distribution centre and a large housing estate, The Woodlands.  Pulloxhill Road is prone to very serious flooding and any further building in this area will exacerbate this problem. In fact at times of heavy rain our rear garden is frequently flooded.
Sallie Phillips	This application suggests that there would be a generous allocation of public space. This area is already used as a public space where the village gathers from time to time. It seems to me that we would be losing space not gaining it, albeit that the space is currently in private hands
Susan Young	The access to this site would be between two listed buildings and would change the whole of the centre of the village in a conservation area. The land is marked as an important open space and should remain so.

**PULLOXHILL APPENDIX TWO**  
Email Representations

No email representations were received for Pulloxhill.

**PULLOXHILL APPENDIX THREE**  
Letters and Reports

<b>Name/Organisation</b>	<b>Subject</b>
David Russell Associates on behalf of Charles Wells Limited	H152 Pulloxhill
The Wildlife Trust	Various sites

## **Site Allocations Survey**

### ***Pulloxhill- Site H152 - Land r/o Cross Keys PH, 3 High Street, Pulloxhill***

The LPA's initial comments identify Pulloxhill as a small village in the emerging Core Strategy, where allocations will be considered where there is an exceptional need for development.

Pulloxhill is one of a number of closely related small villages lying between the town of Flitwick to the west and the A6 Bedford to Luton road to the east.

The site has been largely unused land for some considerable time and there is currently no public access. It is within the existing settlement boundary and within a couple of minutes walk of the village's lower school. Other services and community facilities are available in neighbouring Greenfield, which is less than a mile away to the north.

The site is in a sheltered location just north of the High Street and its development would have little impact on the surrounding countryside. Its topography and orientation enhance its potential for carbon-neutral development that, together with the proposed public amenity space, would result in a significant improvement to the local environment.

Given the factors outlined above, this site is an excellent location for meeting the identified housing needs of Pulloxhill and nearby settlements. These are good reasons to allocate this land to ensure that local housing needs are catered for.

More detailed information in support of the site is contained in the response to the consultation on the document "Site Allocations DPD - Invitation for the submission of sites for residential development".

*David Russell  
David Russell Associates  
14th March 2008*

*For Charles Wells Limited*

Nicola Chessum  
Mid Beds District Council  
Priory House  
Monks Walk  
Chicksands  
SG17 5TQ

Date

### **Mid Beds District Council Site Allocations DPD: Issues and Options Consultation**

Dear Nicola

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Site Allocations Development Plan Document.

The Wildlife Trust has outlined below the ecological issues we are aware of associated with some of these proposed sites. Our comments are made with respect to the potential impacts developing these sites would have both on sites of importance to nature conservation (statutory and non-statutory), as well as on the wider biodiversity network of Mid Bedfordshire.

It is essential to ensure that an ecologically resilient and varied landscape, with a range of habitat types is maintained in Mid Bedfordshire. Maintaining and enhancing this essential biodiversity network will ensure that species retain the ability to move through the landscape as the effects of climate change become manifest. A failure to do this will see populations of species become further fragmented and segregated leading to eventual loss.

In maintaining and enhancing the biodiversity network, we refer not only to protecting statutory sites but also County Wildlife Sites (CWS). These non-statutory wildlife sites are the most important sites in wildlife terms, outside of those with statutory designations, and often of equivalent quality. To retain functionality in ecological terms, the biodiversity network needs sufficient linkages and buffers between and around sites to halt species loss. Also natural corridors such as river corridors are very important for an effective biodiversity network; all of which must be protected from development and damaging management.

Comments are outlined below according to parish, with the list below summarising those potential development sites to which the Wildlife Trust objects. It should not be assumed that sites excluded from this list would not have an adverse impact on nature conservation, and we expect that prior to any site being included within the final site allocations document an ecological assessment be carried out to determine the potential impacts on protected sites and species, and Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) sites and species.

#### **Table of Proposed Sites at which the Wildlife Trust Objects to Development**

H055 (Shefford)	H003/E27 (Arlesey)
H097 (Amphill)	H023/E45 (Aspley Guise/Husborne Crawley)
H122 (Amphill/Maulden)	H144/E36 (Lidlington/Marston Moretaine/Millbrook)
H166 (Biggleswade)	E19 (Amphill)
H193 (Maulden)	E49 (Southill)
H239 (Potton)	E51 (Harlington)

H248 (Flitwick)

**Sites with objections and sites with comments.**

**Ampthill**

***H084***

The woodland to the south of the site forms part of the biodiversity network of the District, as such the Wildlife Trust expect that any development at this site be obligated to conserve, enhance and manage this woodland for the primary purpose of nature conservation.

***H097***

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site. The proposed site is adjacent to Cooper's Hill Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), which is the best remaining example in Bedfordshire of heathland situated on the acidic soils of the Lower Greensand ridge; several species rare in the County can be found here.

Heathland is easily damaged, and we are concerned that siting housing on the adjacent land will result in detrimental amounts of trampling, increasing accidental fires and a loss of the ecological integrity of Cooper's Hill as it becomes cut off from the surrounding countryside by development.

***H122***

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site, which involves landtake from a Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve (Cut-Throat Meadow) which is to the north of the site. The northern section of the proposed site also forms part of the biodiversity network of the District.

***H203***

This proposed development site is adjacent to Ampthill Cemetery and The Knolls CWS. Any development here should not cause any damage to the ecological integrity of the CWS. The site is also opposite a Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve (Cut-Throat Meadow), and funding would be sought in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure these additional houses would create on the site.

***E19***

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it involves landtake from Ampthill Tunnel CWS. Development at this site would also interrupt the biodiversity network of the District; which gives a link towards Warren wood; this linkage is essential to ensure Cooper's Hill SSSI is not cut off from the surrounding countryside.

***H080/E71***

This development is in the footprint of woodland over bluebells. While the existing buildings could be redeveloped with no further impact, additional development would damage this ancient woodland community and have a negative impact on biodiversity.

**Arlesey**

***H048***

This proposed development site is adjacent to Arlesey Meadows CWS. The site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District, as the River Hiz provides a vital corridor for species movement. River corridors should be protected from development to ensure they are able to continue providing ecosystem services such as floodwater control and carbon storage.

***H143***

This proposed development site is adjacent to Blue Lagoon CWS. Development here should not cause any damage to the ecological integrity of the CWS, and we would expect a significant area of chalk grassland to be created that will be managed for the primary purpose of nature conservation, in addition to the proposed country park.

***H156a, H156b and H165***

These proposed sites are within the biodiversity network of the District as the River Hiz provides a vital corridor for species movement. River corridors should be protected from development to ensure they are able to continue providing ecosystem services such as floodwater control and carbon storage.

### **H293**

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. It is also approximately 350m from a Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve (Arlesey Old Moat and Glebe Meadows). Funding would be sought in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure that such a large development would create, unless sufficient open space is provided on-site.

### **E01**

Parcel 1 of this proposed site is within the biodiversity network of the District.

### **H227/E35**

This proposed development site is adjacent to Arlesey Meadows CWS, and forms part of the biodiversity network of the District. The corridor of the River Hiz should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage. The site is also less than 350m from a Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve (Arlesey Old Moat and Glebe Meadows). Funding would be sought in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure that such a large development would create, unless sufficient open space is provided on-site.

### **H003/E27**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it involves landtake from Arlesey Meadows CWS. This site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District, and the corridor of the River Hiz should be protected from development.

### **Aspley Guise**

#### **H001 and H303**

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at either of these sites must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **H023/E45**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it includes Braystone CWS. The site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District, and this area retains some very high quality fragments of neutral grassland now extremely restricted nationally. Development if allowed at this site must ensure that the important grasslands are retained and managed and that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **Biggleswade**

#### **H053**

This proposed development site is less than 100m from Biggleswade Common CWS, part of which is also a Regionally Important Geological and Geomorphological Site (RIGS). Contributions should be made to the appropriate organisation in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure these additional houses would create on the site.

### **H082**

This proposed development site is approximately 200m from Biggleswade Common CWS, part of which is also a RIGS. Contributions should be made to the appropriate organisation in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure these additional houses would create on the site.

### **H166**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it involves landtake from Biggleswade Common CWS.

### ***E58***

This proposed development site is adjacent to the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS, and forms part of the biodiversity network of the District. The corridor of the River Ivel should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

### **Clophill**

#### ***H032***

This proposed development site is adjacent (across A6) to Maulden Wood and Pennyfather's Hill SSSI, and less than 100m from Readshill Grassland CWS. The site also contains woodland. Development at this site should not threaten the ecological integrity of either site. Part of the site also forms part of the biodiversity network of the District.

#### ***H039***

The proposed development site is less than 100m from the River Flit CWS and Cainhoe Lakes CWS. Any development here should not threaten the ecological integrity of either site. The River Flit corridor should be protected to ensure it is able to facilitate species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

### **Cranfield**

#### ***H026***

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at this site must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

#### ***H180***

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at this site must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

#### ***H105***

Development here needs to mitigate for the loss of grassland bird species such as skylark. It is known that Great crested newts are in the vicinity

### **Flitton and Greenfield**

#### ***H117 and H219***

These proposed development sites are less than 500m from Flitton Moor CWS and less than 750m from Flitwick Moor SSSI. The River Flit corridor is extremely important for nature conservation with Flitwick moor of national importance for biodiversity. Any development must not be permitted that would prejudice the ecological integrity of either site or the biodiversity network provided by the River Flit and its immediate area. Development of this size should provide adequate open space for new residents and should not incorporate the existing important and sensitive wildlife sites into calculations of open space provision. Mitigation is likely to be needed for loss of farmland birds in such a large area.

### **Flitwick**

#### ***H062***

The proposed development site is approximately 350m from Flitwick Wood CWS and Local Nature Reserve (LNR). A large development such as this should be providing sufficient open space on-site to ensure that the increase in the local population does not affect the ecological integrity of this site.

#### ***H077***

The proposed development site is adjacent to Steppingley Hospital CWS and less than 500m from Flitwick Wood CWS/LNR. A large development such as this should be providing sufficient open space on-site to ensure that the increase in the local population does not affect the ecological integrity of either site.

#### **H248**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site, as it is adjacent to Flitwick Moor SSSI. Flitwick Moor is the largest area of wetland in Bedfordshire and is outstanding for its botanical and invertebrate interest, as well as being of national importance for mosses and fungi. Building housing on the adjacent farmland will lead to irreparable damage of the special interest of the site through changes to the water supply and quality, disturbance to wildlife and damage caused by an unsustainably high number of visitors to such a fragile habitat. The inclusion of a woodland buffer as part of this proposal is not sufficient to mitigate for the development of 250+ houses adjacent to this nationally important site, and will do nothing to prevent damaging patterns of use developing through and around the SSSI, or diminishment of the water quality in the River Flit (itself a CWS).

#### **E07**

The proposed development is less than 500m from the nationally important Flitwick Moor SSSI. Any development here must be carefully planned to ensure there are no changes to the quantity and quality of water entering the River Flit CWS, which would have detrimental impacts on the special interest features of Flitwick Moor SSSI, as well as several CWS downstream.

#### **Gravenhurst**

##### **H207**

This area of scrubby woodland has local wildlife interest particularly for breeding birds. Its loss would impact on the biodiversity quality of the village.

#### **Harlington**

##### **E51**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this as it involves landtake from the River Flit CWS. The site is adjacent to Poplars Nursery CWS and surrounds the River Flit CWS for approximately 400m. Development at this site could have serious effects on the water quality of the River Flit, which in turn would result in impacts on sites of importance downstream, including Flitwick Moor SSSI. The River Flit corridor forms part of the biodiversity network of the District and should be protected to ensure it is able to facilitate species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

#### **Haynes**

##### **H283**

This proposed development site is less than 100m from Maulden Wood and Pennyfather's Hill SSSI. Development here must not threaten the ecological integrity of these sites, and contributions should be made to the appropriate organisation in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure these additional houses would create.

#### **Henlow**

##### **E76**

The eastern section of this proposed development site is adjacent to the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS, and forms part of the biodiversity network of the District. The corridor of the River Ivel should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

#### **Houghton Conquest**

##### **H275**

The proposed development site is approximately 500m from King's Wood and Glebe Meadows SSSI. A large development such as this should be providing sufficient open space on-site to ensure

that the increase in the local population does not affect the ecological integrity of this nationally important site.

### **E16**

This proposed site is a RIGS (Regionally Important Geological Site), and had a restoration plan to provide 91 hectares of habitat of biodiversity value. Many of the old clay pits in Marston Vale have been designated as CWS, and support important populations of birds, invertebrates and amphibians including BAP species and European Protected Species. The Wildlife Trust would like to see the retention of at least one of these clay pits for nature conservation and Green Infrastructure.

### **Husborne Crawley**

#### **H023/E45**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it includes Braystone CWS. The site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District, and this area retains some high quality fragments of neutral grassland now extremely restricted in Bedfordshire and nationally. Development at this site must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **Langford**

#### **H252**

This proposed development site is adjacent to the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS. The corridor of the River Ivel forms part of the biodiversity network of the District and should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

### **Lidlington**

#### **H031, H211 and E47**

These proposed development sites are adjacent to Brogborough Lake CWS, which retains the last colony of Field Cow-wheat in Bedfordshire (one of only four sites nationally). This arable plant is on the UK BAP and any development at these sites must not threaten the integrity of the colony.

#### **H144/E36**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it includes Heydon Hill CWS and involves landtake from Millbrook Warren CWS. The site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District.

### **Marston Moretaine**

#### **H177**

This proposed development site is adjacent to Stewartby Lake CWS; any development here must not affect its ecological integrity.

### **E61**

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at this site must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

#### **H144/E36**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it includes Heydon Hill CWS and involves landtake from Millbrook Warren CWS. The site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District.

### **Maulden**

#### **H050, H116 and H221**

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District. They are also within 500m of Maulden Church Meadow SSSI. Development at these sites should provide sufficient open space to ensure the increase in the local population does not affect the ecological integrity of the SSSI.

### **H122**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site, which involves landtake from a Wildlife Trust Nature Reserve (Cut-Throat Meadow). The northern section of the proposed site forms part of the biodiversity network of the District.

### **H147, H149 and H204**

These proposed development sites are adjacent to Maulden Wood and Pennyfather's Hill SSSI. Development at these sites must provide adequate open space on-site for new residents to ensure that the ecological integrity of this nationally important site is not affected.

### **H172 and H173**

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at either of these sites must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **H193**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site, which involves landtake from the Flit Valley CWS.

### **H218**

Part of this proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. It is also less than 200m from Duck End Marshy Grassland CWS. Should development go forward at this site, contributions should be made to the appropriate organisation in respect of the increased management required to respond to the visitor pressure these additional houses would create.

### **H225**

This proposed development site is adjacent to the Flit Valley CWS; any development here must not affect its ecological integrity or hydrology.

### **H233**

This proposed development site is within 200m of Maulden Church Meadow SSSI; any development here must not affect its ecological integrity.

### **H281 and E18**

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at either of these sites must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **Millbrook**

#### **H144/E36**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it includes Heydon Hill CWS and involves landtake from Millbrook Warren CWS. The site is also part of the biodiversity network of the District.

### **Northill**

#### **H288**

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at this site must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **E39 and E65**

These proposed development sites are within 150m of the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS, and form part of the biodiversity network of the District. The corridor of the River Ivel should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

### **Old Warden**

### ***E52 and E54***

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District, and Broom Quarry is also a RIGS. Development at either of these sites must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **Potton**

#### ***H010***

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. It is also adjacent to Potton Brook, which holds one of the few remaining Water Vole populations in Bedfordshire. Water voles (from 6 April 2008) and their habitat are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended), and they are UK BAP Priority Species. Any development here must provide sufficient mitigating measures to ensure the Water Vole population is not threatened by disturbance, increased predation by domestic pets or changes to the water quality in Potton Brook.

#### ***H022, H054 and H290***

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at any of these sites must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

#### ***H239***

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this as it involves landtake from Sandy Disused Railway CWS. The site also forms part of the biodiversity network of the District, and part of it is a RIGS.

### **Pulloxhill**

#### ***H152***

This proposed development site is adjacent to Pulloxhill North Marsh CWS; any development here must not affect its ecological integrity.

### **Sandy**

#### ***H151***

Part of this proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. It is also adjacent to the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS. The corridor of the River Ivel should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

#### ***H169, H170, H242 and E70***

These proposed development sites are within the biodiversity network of the District. Development at any of these sites must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats. The sites are all within 200m of The Pinnacle CWS and Sandy Cemetery CWS and development of these sites must provide adequate open space on-site for new residents to ensure that the ecological integrity of these CWS is not affected.

#### ***H276/E13***

The majority of this proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District. It is also adjacent to the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS. The corridor of the River Ivel should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

### **Shefford**

#### ***H055***

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it involves landtake from the River Flit CWS. The River Flit corridor forms part of the biodiversity network of the District and should be protected to ensure it is able to facilitate species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

### **H213 and H306**

These proposed development sites are adjacent to the River Flit CWS. The River Flit corridor should be protected and any development here must not affect its ecological integrity.

### **H287**

This proposed development site runs adjacent to Old Warden Tunnel CWS for over 600m. Any development here must not affect its ecological integrity, and we would expect substantial and appropriate buffering to be put in place between the development and the CWS. A large development such as this should be providing sufficient open space on-site and ensuring that natural corridors are maintained throughout.

### **Southill**

#### **E49**

The Wildlife Trust **objects** to development at this site as it involves landtake from Rowney Warren CWS. This CWS is on acidic Greensand soils, and has potential, at a county level of importance, for creation of lowland heathland, a UK and Local BAP habitat. With sensitive siting of buildings and habitat creation and mitigation an acceptable plan could be proposed.

#### **E52**

This proposed development site is within the biodiversity network of the District, and Broom Quarry is also a RIGS. Any development at this site must ensure that natural corridors are maintained throughout the development to prevent further isolation of species and habitats.

### **Steppingley**

#### **H062**

The proposed development site is approximately 350m from Flitwick Wood CWS and Local Nature Reserve (LNR). A large development such as this should be providing sufficient open space on-site to ensure that the increase in the local population does not affect the ecological integrity of this site.

### **Stotfold**

#### **H056 and E06**

These proposed development sites are adjacent to the Rivers Ivel and Hiz CWS. The corridor of the River Ivel should be protected from development to ensure it is able to provide a corridor for species movement and continue providing ecosystem services such as carbon storage and floodwater storage.

I hope that this information is instructive, I will be happy to answer any queries on the content of this consultation response.

Yours sincerely,

Laurie Jackson  
Planning and Biodiversity Officer (Bedfordshire)

**PULLOXHILL APPENDIX FOUR**  
Respondents' Postcodes

Below is a list of respondents' postcodes (where available) who submitted surveys or representations in other formats, about sites in the parish or about Pulloxhill in general.

Postcode
AL4 8AY
MK40 3JJ
MK45 5DE
MK45 5DG
MK45 5ED
MK45 5EH
MK45 5ES
MK45 5EX
MK45 5EY
MK45 5EZ
MK45 5HA
MK45 5HF
MK45 5HG
MK45 5HN
MK45 5HP
MK45 5HW